DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 221 707 CE 033 852

AUTHOR Thomas, Edward L.; Shill, James F.
TITLE Funds Reduction Survey: 1982 Summary Report.
INSTITUTION Mississippi Research and Curriculum Unit for Vocational and Technical Education, State College.
PUB DATE Mar 82
NOTE 49p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Attitudes; Budgeting; Educational Finance; *Educational Needs; *Financial Needs; Financial Support; Needs Assessment; Postsecondary Education; Questionnaires; *Reduction in Force; *Retrenchment; Secondary Education; State Surveys; *Vocational Directors; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Mississippi

ABSTRACT

A study gathered input from 176 local vocational administrators concerning vocational funding priorities at the secondary and postsecondary levels in Mississippi. Addressed in the survey were the following issues: which of some 19 areas of basic grant money programs should be reduced; which areas should be reduced first; what factors should be considered when contemplating the elimination of individual programs; should a reduction of employee contracts from 12 to 11 or 10 to 9 months be considered as a viable alternative in the event that funds must be reduced; and, in the event of a necessary reduction in personnel, should funding for instructional, guidance, or administrative personnel be reduced first. Respondents indicated that trade and industrial education, secondary education, technical education, and administration were of the highest priority and should be the last cut. Current employment opportunities in the area and recent past enrollment figures emerged as the two most important factors to be considered when keeping some programs at the expense of others. Guidance and support service personnel were considered the most expendible, while administrative personnel were felt to be the least expendible. The survey instrument and 28 tables are appended. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED221707

FUNDS REDUCTION SURVEY
1982
SUMMARY REPORT

Research and Curriculum Unit
State Department of Education
Division of Vocational-Technical Education

Edward L. Thomas
James F. Shill

March, 1982

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. SHILL

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 033 852

The State of Mississippi is an equal opportunity employer and does not discriminate or deny services on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, handicap and/or age.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	iv
Purpose	1
Methodology	1
Appendix A (Memo from Elwyn Wheat)	2
Appendix B (Survey Form)	5
Appendix C (Tables)	10
Appendix D (Comments)	39

LIST OF TABLES

Tables		Page
1.	Total Group Responses to the 1982 Funds Reduction Survey	11
2.	Total Group Responses to Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs	20
3.	Total Group and Individual Responses to the Question "Should The Reduction of Contracts From 12 to 11 or 10 to 9 Months Be Considered As An Alternative In The Event of Cutbacks in Funding?"	38
4.	Total Group Responses To, "If a Reduction in Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank in Priority Order Which of The Following Should Be Reduced First."	29
5.	Secondary Level Responses to the 1982 Funds Reduction Survey	12
6.	Secondary Level Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs	21
7.	Secondary Level Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which of The Following Should Be Reduced First	30
8.	Post-Secondary Responses to the 1982 Funds Reduction Survey	13
9.	Post-Secondary Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs.	22
10.	Post-Secondary Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which of The Following Should Be Reduced First	31
11.	Secondary and Post-Secondary Responses to the 1982 Funds Reduction Survey.	14
12.	Secondary and Post-Secondary Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs	23
13.	Secondary and Post-Secondary Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which of the Following Should be Reduced First.	32

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Tables		Page
14.	Superintendents' Responses to the 1982 Funds Reduction Survey	15
15.	Superintendents' Responses to Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs	24
16.	Superintendents' Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which of the Following Should Be Reduced First	33
17.	Junior College Presidents' Responses to the 1982 Funds Reduction Survey	16
18.	Junior College Presidents' Responses to Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs	25
19.	Junior College Presidents' Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which of the Following Should Be Reduced First	34
20.	Local Vocational Directors' Responses to the 1982 Funds Reduction Survey	17
21.	Local Vocational Directors' Responses to Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs.	26
22.	Local Vocational Directors' Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which of the Following Should Be Reduced First	35
23.	Junior College Deans' Responses to the 1982 Funds Reduction Survey	18
24.	Junior College Deans' Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs	27
25.	Junior College Deans' Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which of the Following Should be Reduced First	36
26.	Assistant Directors' and Others' Responses to the 1982 Funds Reduction Survey	19
27.	Assistant Directors' and Others' Responses to Factors Which Should Be considered When Eliminating Individual Programs.	28

LIST OF TABLES (Cont'd.)

Tables Page

28. Assistant Directors' and Others' Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which of the Following Should Be Reduced First 37

PURPOSE OF THE SURVEY

The purpose of this survey was to obtain input from local vocational administrators concerning vocational funding priorities at the secondary and post-secondary levels in Mississippi. Should a reduction in vocational funds become necessary in the near future and subsequently result in a decrease in funding at the local levels, vocational decision makers will rely upon data provided in this Summary Report to help determine areas in which a funding reduction will most likely occur.

METHODOLOGY

Some 280 survey forms were prepared by Research and Curriculum Unit personnel for mailing to local School Superintendents, Junior College Presidents and Deans, local Secondary and Post-Secondary Vocational Directors and Assistant Directors. To facilitate returns, a letter of explanation (Appendix A) from the State Director of Vocational-Technical Education was affixed to each survey form (Appendix B) along with a return self-addressed and stamped envelope. Each person in the survey population was asked to respond to questions in the following areas:

1. Which of some 19 areas of basic grant money programs should be reduced?
2. Which of the 19 areas should be reduced first?
3. What factors should be considered when contemplating the elimination of individual programs?
4. Should a reduction of employee contracts from 12 to 11 or 10 to 9 months be considered as a viable alternative in the event funds must be reduced?
5. Should a reduction in funding for instructional, guidance and administrative personnel occur, which of these would you reduce first?

All survey forms were returned to the Research and Curriculum Unit for coding, key punching and verification for processing. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS), an integrated system of computer programs was used to obtain frequency counts, means, etc. One hundred and seventy-six (176) or sixty-three (63) percent of the two hundred and eighty (280) administrators surveyed returned the surveys in usable form. A breakdown of the surveyed population returning the forms is as follows:

Local Superintendents	70
Local Junior College Presidents and Deans . .	10
Local Vocational Directors.	88
Assistant Directors and Others.	8
Total	176

The above data includes some 145 secondary level and 31 post-secondary level respondents. See Appendix C for specific tables which depict administrators' responses to the five question areas. Appendix D contains a listing of comments made on the survey form.

APPENDIX A

(Memo From Elwyn Wheat)

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
C. E. Holladay, Ed.D. • State Superintendent

DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
P. O. Box 771 • Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Elwyn G. Wheat,
Director

December 4, 1981 MEMO # 82-95

TO: All Vocational Directors

FROM: Elwyn G. Wheat, Director, Vocational-Technical Division,
State Department of Education

Enclosed please find the Anticipated Funds Reduction Survey I mentioned to you. This should be helpful to us in Vocational Education on our 5 year planning procedures.

I would like your thought on the survey, returning it in the enclosed envelope with the appropriate explanation.

Enclosures

EGW/er

STATE OF MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
C. E. Holladay, Ed.D. • State Superintendent

DIVISION OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
P. O. Box 771 • Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Elwyn G. Wheat,
Director

Memo No.: 82-95

January 6, 1982

TO: Superintendents and Junior College Presidents

FROM: Elwyn G. Wheat, Director, Vocational-Technical Division,
State Department of Education

Enclosed please find the Anticipated Funds Reduction Survey I mentioned to you. This should be helpful to us in Vocational Education on our 5 year planning.

I would like your thought on the survey, returning it in the enclosed envelope with the appropriate explanation.

Enclosures

EGW:jd

APPENDIX B

(Survey Form)

ANTICIPATED FUNDS REDUCTION SURVEY

In the event that a 10 percent reduction in state funding level (Approximately $3.1 million) and a 12 percent reduction in Federal funding level (Approximately $1 million) comes to pass, funding will have to be reduced from the state. In the event that this happens, which areas of the basic grant money programs of necessity should be reduced? Please check (√) the response most closely related to your desires.

	Reduction in Funding Level as Required				
	Elimination of Funding 5	High Reduction 4	Moderate Reduction 3	Low Reduction 2	No Reduction 1
1. Construction					
2. Equipment					
3. Travel					
4. Program Level					
(a) Post-Secondary					
(b) Secondary					
5. Administration					
6. Guidance & Counseling					
7. Agriculture					
8. Health					
9. Trade & Industry					
10. Distributive Education					
11. Cooperative Education					
12. Home Economics					
13. Technical					
14. Industrial Arts					
15. Special Programs					
16. Business and Office					
17. Adult					

	Reduction in Funding Level as Required				
	Elimination of Funding 5	High Reduction 4	Moderate Reduction 3	Low Reduction 2	No Reduction 1
18. Industry Services					
19. Other (Specify)					

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

20. Rank by priority the four areas or services which should receive reduction in funding first.

(a) _____

(b) _____

(c) _____

(d) _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

21. In the event the number of programs was reduced to bring funds into line, how would you rank (1 = highest; 10 = lowest) the following factors as consideration for elimination of individual programs.

_____ (a) Total number of programs in state

_____ (b) Current employment opportunities in area

_____ (c) Five-year evaluation report

_____ (d) Past three years enrollments in the program

_____ (e) Follow-up data (percentage of completers employed in area trained for)

_____ (f) Cost of program

_____ (g) Population served

_____ (h) Unemployment in area

_____ (i) Districts ability to support program locally

_____ (j) Quality of instructional personnel

_____ (k) Other (Specify) _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

22. Should reduction of contracts from 12 to 11 or 10 to 9 months (if legal), be considered as an alternative in the event of cutbacks?

_____ Yes _____ No

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

23. If reduction in contracts becomes a viable alternative, rank in priority order which of the following should be reduced first?

_____ Administrative Personnel

_____ Guidance and Other Supportive Personnel

_____ Instructional Personnel

Comments: _____

_____

_____

_____

24. Please list three suggestions for improving management of Vocational Education in Mississippi.

1. _____

_____

_____

2. _____

_____

_____

3. _____

_____

_____

25. My institution offers:

_____ (a) Secondary Programs _____ (b) Post-Secondary Programs

_____ (c) Both Secondary and Post-Secondary Programs

26. My current position is classified as:

_____ (a) Superintendent

_____ (b) President

_____ (c) Local Vocational Director

_____ (d) Dean

_____ (e) Other (Specify) _____

APPENDIX C

(Tables)

TABLE 1

Total Group Responses To the 1982 Funds Reduction Survey
(Frequencies)

Item	No. of Educators Favoring					Rank*
	Eli. of Fund.	High Red.	Mod. Red.	Low Red.	No. Red.	
Construction	32	69	51	12	12	19
Equipment	1	15	77	45	38	9
Travel	11	34	60	31	40	16
Post-Secondary	1	23	67	56	29	11.5
Secondary	0	4	51	70	51	2
Administ.	1	17	47	55	56	4
Guid. & Couns.	9	25	50	44	48	10
Agriculture	6	33	61	47	29	15
Health	13	19	58	51	34	14
T & I	1	4	41	67	63	1
D.E.	2	22	57	56	39	7
Coop. Ed.	2	24	58	49	43	8
Home Ec.	4	12	51	51	58	5.5
Technical	1	10	47	66	52	3
Ind. Arts	8	30	49	43	46	11.5
Sp. Prog.	16	41	67	37	15	18
B. & O.	0	15	52	56	53	5.5
Adult	15	45	66	28	22	17
Ind. Serv.	10	23	61	47	35	13

No. of Respondents = 176 .

* Those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks which range from 1-4 are "high priority" and should be the last programs, services, etc. considered for a reduction in funds. Likewise, those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks 17-20 should be considered as programs with somewhat less priority.

TABLE 5

Secondary Level Responses To The 1982 Funds Reduction Survey
(Frequencies)

Item	No. of Educators Favoring					Rank*
	Eli. of Fund.	High Red.	Mod. Red.	Low Red.	No. Red.	
Construction	27	59	40	9	10	19
Equipment	1	10	68	36	30	10
Travel	10	25	50	26	34	14
Post-Secondary	1	23	59	39	23	12
Secondary	0	1	39	59	46	2
Adminis t.	1	17	40	41	46	6
Guid. & Couns.	9	23	41	34	38	11
Agriculture	5	25	52	37	26	13
Health	1	14	52	34	26	16
T & I	1	4	36	51	53	1
D.E.	2	16	46	47	34	8.5
Coop. Ed.	2	18	44	42	39	7
Home Ec.	4	5	41	40	55	3
Technical	1	10	44	53	37	5
Ind. Arts	6	17	42	36	44	8.5
Sp. Prog.	16	35	54	27	13	17
B. & O.	0	13	45	44	43	4
Adult	14	40	57	19	15	18
Ind. Serv.	10	21	56	33	25	15

No. of Respondents = 145 .

* Those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks which range from 1-4 are "high priority" and should be the last programs, services, etc. considered for a reduction in funds. Likewise, those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks 17-20 should be considered as programs with somewhat less priority.

TABLE 8

Post-Secondary Responses To The 1982 Funds Reduction Survey
(Frequencies)

Item	No. of Educators Favoring					Rank*
	Eli. of Fund.	High Red.	Mod. Red.	Low Red.	No. Red.	
Construction	4	6	4	1	0	19
Equipment	0	4	4	4	3	9.5
Travel	1	6	4	3	1	16.5
Post-Secondary	0	0	4	8	3	7
Secondary	0	3	6	4	2	11.5
Administ.	0	0	3	8	4	4
Guid. & Couns.	0	1	5	4	5	8
Agriculture	0	6	6	3	0	16.5
Health	0	0	3	9	3	5.5
T & I	0	0	2	9	4	3
D.E.	0	2	7	4	2	9.5
Coop. Ed.	0	4	8	2	1	14
Home Ec.	0	5	6	4	0	15
Technical	0	0	1	8	6	1
Ind. Arts	2	8	3	1	1	18
Sp. Prog.	0	3	7	5	0	13
B. & O.	0	2	2	5	6	5.5
Adult	1	3	4	4	3	11.5
Ind. Serv.	0	0	2	7	6	2

No. of Respondents = 15 .

* Those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks which range from 1-4 are "high priority" and should be the last programs, services, etc. considered for a reduction in funds. Likewise, those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks 17-20 should be considered as programs with somewhat less priority.

TABLE 11

Secondary and Post-Secondary Responses To The 1982 Funds Reduction Survey
(Frequencies)

Item	No. of Educators Favoring					Rank*
	Eli. of Fund.	High Red.	Mod. Red.	Low Red.	No. Red.	
Construction	1	4	7	2	2	19
Equipment	0	1	5	5	5	8
Travel	0	3	6	2	5	13.5
Post-Secondary	0	0	4	9	3	6
Secondary	0	0	6	7	3	9.5
Administ.	0	0	4	6	6	3.5
Guid. & Couns.	0	1	4	6	5	6
Agriculture	1	2	3	7	3	13.5
Health	0	0	3	8	5	3.5
T & I	0	0	3	7	6	2
D.E.	0	4	4	5	3	16
Coop. Ed.	0	2	6	5	3	15
Home Ec.	0	2	4	7	3	11.5
Technical	0	0	2	5	9	1
Ind. Arts	0	5	4	6	1	18
Sp. Prog.	0	3	6	5	2	17
B. & O.	0	0	5	7	4	6
Adult	0	2	5	5	4	11.5
Ind. Serv.	0	2	3	7	4	9.5

No. of Respondents = 16 .

* Those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks which range from 1-4 are "high priority" and should be the last programs, services, etc. considered for a reduction in funds. Likewise, those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks 17-20 should be considered as programs with somewhat less priority.

TABLE 14

Superintendents' Responses To The 1982 Funds Reduction Survey
(Frequencies)

Item	No. of Educators Favoring					Rank*
	Eli. of Fund.	High Red.	Mod. Red.	Low Red.	No. Red.	
Construction	15	22	22	4	7	19
Equipment	1	6	32	15	16	9
Travel	7	17	30	7	9	12
Post-Secondary	1	13	21	23	12	10
Secondary	0	0	17	33	20	1.5
Administ.	1	11	27	19	12	11
Guid. & Couns.	6	15	19	16	14	14
Agriculture	5	13	26	13	13	15
Health	10	10	25	13	12	16
T & I	1	3	21	23	22	3
D.E.	1	8	25	21	15	8
Coop. Ed.	1	7	25	19	18	6
Home Ec.	0	3	19	20	28	1.5
Technical	0	4	21	26	19	4
Ind. Arts	1	6	25	19	19	5
Sp. Prog.	8	15	27	16	4	13
B. & O.	0	9	27	17	17	7
Adult	9	18	24	13	6	18
Ind. Serv.	8	9	29	17	7	17

No. of Respondents = 70 .

* Those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks which range from 1-4 are "high priority" and should be the last programs, services, etc. considered for a reduction in funds. Likewise, those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks 17-20 should be considered as programs with somewhat less priority.

TABLE 17

Junior College Presidents' Responses To The 1982 Funds Reduction Survey
(Frequencies)

Item	No. of Educators Favoring					Rank*
	Eli. of Fund.	High Red.	Mod. Red.	Low Red.	No. Red.	
Construction	2	3	1	1	0	19
Equipment	0	2	3	1	1	12
Travel	0	4	1	2	0	18
Post-Secondary	0	0	3	4	0	7
Secondary	0	1	2	4	0	9
Administ.	0	0	2	4	1	4.5
Guid. & Couns.	0	1	3	2	1	9
Agriculture	0	3	2	2	0	16.5
Health	0	0	0	6	1	1.5
T & I	0	0	1	5	1	3
D.E.	0	0	4	3	0	9
Coop. Ed.	0	2	3	2	0	14.5
Home Ec.	0	2	2	3	0	12
Technical	0	0	1	6	0	4.5
Ind. Arts	0	3	2	2	0	16.5
Sp. Prog.	0	2	3	2	0	14.5
B. & O.	0	1	1	4	1	6
Adult	0	2	2	3	0	12
Ind. Serv.	0	0	1	4	2	1.5

No. of Respondents = 7 .

* Those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks which range from 1-4 are "high priority" and should be the last programs, services, etc. considered for a reduction in funds. Likewise, those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks 17-20 should be considered as programs with somewhat less priority.

TABLE 20

Local Vocational Directors' Responses To The 1982 Funds Reduction Survey (Frequencies)

Item	No. of Educators Favoring					Rank*
	Eli. of Fund.	High Red.	Mod. Red.	Low Red.	No. Red.	
Construction	12	41	24	7	4	19
Equipment	0	7	39	26	16	14
Travel	3	11	27	21	26	9.5
Post-Secondary	0	6	41	24	17	13
Secondary	0	2	29	29	28	4
Administ.	0	2	18	28	40	2
Guid. & Couns.	2	7	22	25	32	6
Agriculture	1	15	30	29	13	15
Health	3	6	30	29	20	12
T & I	0	1	14	35	38	1
D.E.	1	12	25	29	21	8
Coop. Ed.	1	13	27	25	22	11
Home Ec.	4	6	28	25	25	7
Technical	1	6	21	32	28	5
Ind. Arts	6	18	21	19	24	16
Sp. Prog.	8	23	31	18	8	18
B. & O.	0	4	20	32	32	3
Adult	4	22	37	11	14	17
Ind. Serv.	1	11	30	23	23	9.5

No. of Respondents = 88 .

* Those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks which range from 1-4 are "high priority" and should be the last programs, services, etc. considered for a reduction in funds. Likewise, those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks 17-20 should be considered as programs with somewhat less priority.

TABLE 23

Junior College Deans' Responses To The 1982 Funds Reduction Survey
(Frequencies)

Item	No. of Educators Favoring					Rank*
	Eli. of Fund.	High Red.	Mod. Red.	Low Red.	No. Red.	
Construction	0	1	1	0	1	11
Equipment	0	0	1	0	2	4.5
Travel	0	0	0	1	2	2.5
Post-Secondary	0	0	0	3	0	6
Secondary	0	0	2	1	0	11
Administ.	0	0	0	2	1	4.5
Guid. & Couns.	0	0	3	0	0	15
Agriculture	0	0	2	1	0	11
Health	0	0	1	2	0	7.5
T & I	0	0	1	2	0	7.5
D.E.	0	1	1	1	0	15
Coop. Ed.	0	2	1	0	0	18
Home Ec.	0	1	2	0	0	17
Technical	0	0	0	1	2	2.5
Ind. Arts	1	2	0	0	0	19
Sp. Prog.	0	0	2	1	0	11
B. & O.	0	0	2	1	1	11
Adult	1	0	1	0	1	15
Ind. Serv.	0	0	0	0	3	1

No. of Respondents = 3 .

* Those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks which range from 1-4 are "high priority" and should be the last programs, services, etc. considered for a reduction in funds. Likewise, those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks 17-20 should be considered as programs with somewhat less priority.

TABLE 26

Assistant Directors' (Others') Responses To The 1982 Funds Reduction Survey (Frequencies)

Item	No. of Educators Favoring					Rank*
	Eli. of Fund.	High Red.	Mod. Red.	Low Red.	No. Red.	
Construction	3	2	3	0	0	19
Equipment	0	0	2	3	3	2.5
Travel	1	2	2	0	3	12.5
Post-Secondary	0	4	2	2	0	16.5
Secondary	0	1	1	3	3	4.5
Adminis t.	0	4	0	2	2	12.5
Guid. & Couns.	1	2	3	1	1	14
Agriculture	0	2	1	2	3	8
Health	1	3	2	1	1	16.5
T & I	0	0	4	2	2	8
D.E.	0	1	2	2	3	8
Coop. Ed.	0	0	2	3	3	2.5
Home Ec.	0	0	0	3	5	1
Technical	0	0	4	1	3	8
Ind. Arts	0	1	1	3	3	4.5
Sp. Prog.	0	1	4	0	3	11
B. & O.	0	1	2	2	3	8
Adult	1	3	2	1	1	16.5
Ind. Serv.	1	3	1	3	0	16.5

No. of Respondents = 8 .

* Those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks which range from 1-4 are "high priority" and should be the last programs, services, etc. considered for a reduction in funds. Likewise, those programs, services, etc. receiving ranks 17-20 should be considered as programs with somewhat less priority.

TABLE 2

Total Group Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs (Frequencies)

Factors	No. of Ed. Ranking Each Factor on a 1-10 Scale										Rank*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Total No. Prog. in State	17	9	13	14	24	9	16	21	14	39	9
Curr. Employ. Opp. in Area	49	24	26	15	22	19	7	6	4	4	1
Five-Yr. Eval. Rpt.	7	6	12	19	30	11	21	19	28	23	10
Past 3 Yr. Enroll.	40	30	27	17	20	7	11	14	7	3	2
Follow-up Data	23	29	26	21	20	6	14	13	13	11	3
Cost of Program	11	13	21	14	26	17	21	25	11	17	7
Population Served	18	19	18	19	18	25	12	19	14	14	5
Unemployment	18	14	17	19	23	17	17	15	21	15	6
Dist. Abil. To Sup. Prog.	16	14	13	17	24	11	12	26	18	25	8
Qual. of Personnel	24	28	15	11	26	16	10	13	14	19	4

No. of Respondents = 176 .

* Those factors receiving ranks of 1-5 are "high priority" factors which should be considered first when planning to eliminate individual programs. Factors receiving ranks of 6-10 should also receive consideration, however, to a lesser degree.

TABLE 6

Secondary Level Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs (Frequencies)

Factors	No. of Ed. Ranking Each Factor on a 1-10 Scale										Rank*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Total No. Prog. in State	12	5	11	13	18	8	13	20	9	36	10
Curr. Employ. Opp. in Area	44	17	23	10	18	16	6	5	4	2	1
Five-Yr. Eval. Rpt.	6	5	9	15	26	10	15	17	25	17	9
Past 3 Yr. Enroll.	30	24	22	15	19	7	9	11	6	2	2
Follow-up Data	18	22	20	20	16	5	11	11	12	10	3
Cost of Program	10	13	18	13	21	12	15	23	9	11	7
Population Served	17	17	14	15	17	16	8	16	14	11	5
Unemployment	16	13	14	16	21	14	16	10	14	11	6
Dist. Abil. To Sup. Prog.	14	12	12	14	21	10	10	19	15	18	8
Qual. of Personnel	20	26	15	9	18	15	9	10	10	13	4

No. of Respondents = 145 .

* Those factors receiving ranks of 1-5 are "high priority" factors which should be considered first when planning to eliminate individual programs. Factors receiving ranks of 6-10 should also receive consideration, however, to a lesser degree.

TABLE 9

Post-Secondary Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs (Frequencies)

Factors	No. of Ed. Ranking Each Factor on a 1-10 Scale										Rank*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Total No. Prog. in State	4	2	1	0	2	0	2	0	3	1	4
Curr. Employ. Opp. in Area	3	2	3	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	3
Five-Yr. Eval. Rpt.	0	1	1	3	2	0	2	2	1	3	8
Past 3 Yr. Enroll.	5	3	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	1
Follow-up Data	2	4	4	0	1	0	1	2	0	1	2
Cost of Program	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	1	0	3	9
Population Served	1	0	2	3	1	3	1	3	0	1	5
Unemployment	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	5	4	10
Dist. Abil. To Sup. Prog.	2	0	0	1	3	1	2	2	2	2	6
Qual. of Personnel	2	0	0	1	5	1	0	1	0	5	7

No. of Respondents = 15 .

* Those factors receiving ranks of 1-5 are "high priority" factors which should be considered first when planning to eliminate individual programs. Factors receiving ranks of 6-10 should also receive consideration, however, to a lesser degree.

TABLE 12

Secondary and Post-Secondary Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs (Frequencies)

Factors	No. of Ed. Ranking Each Factor on a 1-10 Scale										Rank*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Total No. Prog. in State	1	2	1	1	4	1	1	1	2	2	6
Curr. Employ. Opp. in Area	2	5	0	4	5	2	0	0	0	0	2
Five-Yr. Eval. Rpt.	1	0	2	1	2	1	4	0	2	3	9
Past 3 Yr. Enroll.	5	3	3	2	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Follow-up Data	3	3	2	1	3	1	2	0	1	0	3
Cost of Program	1	0	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	8
Population Served	0	2	2	1	0	6	3	0	0	2	5
Unemployment	1	1	3	2	0	2	0	5	2	0	4
Dist. Abil. To Sup. Prog.	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	5	1	5	10
Qual. of Personnel	2	2	0	1	3	0	1	2	4	1	7

No. of Respondents = 16 .

* Those factors receiving ranks of 1-5 are "high priority" factors which should be considered first when planning to eliminate individual programs. Factors receiving ranks of 6-10 should also receive consideration, however, to a lesser degree.

TABLE 15

Superintendents' Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs (Frequencies)

Factors	No. of Ed. Ranking Each Factor on a 1-10 Scale										Rank*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Total No. Prog. in State	5	4	3	8	7	2	11	9	5	16	10
Curr. Employ. Opp. in Area	17	9	14	3	10	10	4	1	2	0	1
Five-Yr. Eval. Rpt.	2	2	6	8	12	5	10	7	9	9	9
Past 3 Yr. Enroll.	15	12	13	6	8	4	4	5	3	0	2
Follow-up Data	12	13	9	10	4	3	6	3	7	3	3
Cost of Program	2	10	12	8	11	5	7	7	3	5	4
Population Served	6	10	8	9	6	6	4	11	6	4	5
Unemployment	5	7	6	7	5	9	10	5	11	5	7
Dist. Abil. To Sup. Prog.	9	5	0	11	9	3	3	11	11	8	8
Qual. of Personnel	6	8	7	3	7	13	3	7	6	10	6

No. of Respondents = 70 .

* Those factors receiving ranks of 1-5 are "high priority" factors which should be considered first when planning to eliminate individual programs. Factors receiving ranks of 6-10 should also receive consideration, however, to a lesser degree.

TABLE 18

Junior College Presidents' Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs (Frequencies)

Factors	No. of Ed. Ranking Each Factor on a 1-10 Scale										Rank*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Total No. Prog. in State	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	2	1	5
Curr. Employ. Opp. in Area	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	3
Five-Yr. Eval. Rpt.	0	1	0	3	0	0	1	1	0	1	4
Past 3 Yr. Enroll.	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Follow-up Data	0	3	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	2
Cost of Program	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	0	0	1	7
Population Served	1	0	0	2	0	0	1	3	0	0	6
Unemployment	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	1	10
Dist. Abil. To Sup. Prog.	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	1	9
Qual. of Personnel	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	2	8

No. of Respondents = 7 .

* Those factors receiving ranks of 1-5 are "high priority" factors which should be considered first when planning to eliminate individual programs. Factors receiving ranks of 6-10 should also receive consideration, however, to a lesser degree.

TABLE 21

Local Vocational Director's Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs (Frequencies)

Factors	No. of Ed. Ranking Each Factor on a 1-10 Scale										Rank*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Total No. Prog. in State	9	4	7	5	16	6	4	10	7	20	9
Curr. Employ. Opp. in Area	27	11	11	11	10	7	2	3	2	4	1
Five-Yr. Eval. Rpt.	4	3	6	7	16	6	8	10	17	11	10
Past 3 Yr. Enroll.	21	12	10	11	11	3	6	8	3	3	2
Follow-up Data	9	11	15	9	14	3	7	7	5	8	4
Cost of Program	8	3	7	5	11	7	12	18	7	10	8
Population Served	10	9	9	8	10	17	7	3	6	9	6
Unemployment	10	6	10	11	15	8	6	10	5	7	5
Dist. Abil. To Sup. Prog.	7	8	11	4	12	6	8	12	7	13	7
Qual. of Personnel	17	19	7	7	13	2	5	5	6	7	3

No. of Respondents = 88 .

* Those factors receiving ranks of 1-5 are "high priority" factors which should be considered first when planning to eliminate individual programs. Factors receiving ranks of 6-10 should also receive consideration, however, to a lesser degree.

TABLE 24

Junior College Deans' Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs (Frequencies)

Factors	No. of Ed. Ranking Each Factor on a 1-10 Scale										Rank*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Total No. Prog. in State	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	8
Curr. Employ. Opp. in Area	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Five-Yr. Eval. Rpt.	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	9
Past 3 Yr. Enroll.	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	3
Follow-up Data	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2
Cost of Program	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Population Served	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	7
Unemployment	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	10
Dist. Abil. To Sup. Prog.	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Qual. of Personnel	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	6

No. of Respondents = 3 .

* Those factors receiving ranks of 1-5 are "high priority" factors which should be considered first when planning to eliminate individual programs. Factors receiving ranks of 6-10 should also receive consideration, however, to a lesser degree.

TABLE 27

Assistant Directors' (Others') Responses To Factors Which Should Be Considered When Eliminating Individual Programs (Frequencies)

Factors	No. of Ed. Ranking Each Factor on a 1-10 Scale										Rank*
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Total No. Prog. in State	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4
Curr. Employ. Opp. in Area	4	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	2
Five-Yr. Eval. Rpt.	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	8
Past 3 Yr. Enroll.	0	4	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Follow-up Data	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	2	1	0	5
Cost of Program	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	7
Population Served	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	2	2	0	9
Unemployment	3	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	3
Dist. Abil. To Sup. Prog.	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	3	10
Qual. of Personnel	1	1	0	0	3	0	2	0	1	0	6

No. of Respondents = 8 .

* Those factors receiving ranks of 1-5 are "high priority" factors which should be considered first when planning to eliminate individual programs. Factors receiving ranks of 6-10 should also receive consideration, however, to a lesser degree.

TABLE 4

Group Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which Of The Following Should Be Reduced First?" (Frequencies)

Classification	Priority			Rank*
	1	2	3	
Administrative Per.	21	44	111	3
Guid. and Supp. Serv.	100	72	4	1
Inst. Personnel	66	55	55	2

No. of Respondents = 176 .

* Reduce classifications with Rank of 1 first!

TABLE 7

Secondary Level Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which Of The Following Should Be Reduced First?"
(Frequencies)

Classification	Priority			Rank*
	1	2	3	
Administrative Per.	20	37	88	3
Guid. and Supp. Serv.	92	51	2	1
Inst. Personnel	44	54	49	2

No. of Respondents = 145 .

* Reduce classifications with Rank of 1 first!

TABLE 10

Post-Secondary Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which Of The Following Should Be Reduced First?" (Frequencies)

Classification	Priority			Rank*
	1	2	3	
Administrative Per.	1	4	10	3
Guid. and Supp. Serv.	4	10	1	2
Inst. Personnel	10	1	4	1

No. of Respondents = 15 .

* Reduce classifications with Rank of 1 first!

TABLE 13

Secondary and Post-Secondary Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which Of The Following Should Be Reduced First?"
(Frequencies)

Classification	Priority			Rank*
	1	2	3	
Administrative Per.	0	3	13	3
Guid. and Supp. Serv.	4	11	1	2
Inst. Personnel	12	2	2	1

No. of Respondents = 16 .

* Reduce classifications with Rank of 1 first!

TABLE 16

Superintendents' Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which Of The Following Should Be Reduced First?" (Frequencies)

Classification	Priority			Rank*
	1	2	3	
Administrative Per.	14	23	33	3
Guid. and Supp. Serv.	40	28	2	1
Inst. Personnel	21	17	32	2

No. of Respondents = 70 .

* Reduce classifications with Rank of 1 first!

TABLE 19

Junior College Presidents' Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which Of The Following Should Be Reduced First?"
(Frequencies)

Classification	Priority			Rank*
	1	2	3	
Administrative Per.	0	2	5	3
Guid. and Supp. Serv.	1	5	1	2
Inst. Personnel	6	0	1	1

No. of Respondents = 7 .

* Reduce classifications with Rank of 1 first!

TABLE 22

Local Vocational Directors' Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which Of The Following Should Be Reduced First?"
(Frequencies)

Classification	Priority			Rank*
	1	2	3	
Administrative Per.	5	14	69	3
Guid. and Supp. Serv.	54	34	0	1
Inst. Personnel	35	37	16	2

No. of Respondents = 88 .

* Reduce classifications with Rank of 1 first!

TABLE 25

Junior College Deans' Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which Of The Following Should Be Reduced First?"
(Frequencies)

Classification	Priority			Rank*
	1	2	3	
Administrative Per.	0	0	3	3
Guid. and Supp. Serv.	1	2	0	2
Inst. Personnel	2	1	0	1

No. of Respondents = 3 .

* Reduce classifications with Rank of 1 first!

TABLE 28

Assistant Directors' (Others') Responses To, "If a Reduction In Contracts Becomes An Alternative, Rank In Priority Order Which Of The Following Should Be Reduced First?"
(Frequencies)

Classification	Priority			Rank*
	1	2	3	
Administrative Per.	2	5	1	2
Guid. and Supp. Serv.	4	3	1	1
Inst. Personnel	2	0	6	3

No. of Respondents = 8 .

* Reduce classifications with Rank of 1 first!

TABLE 3

Group and Individual Responses To The Question, "Should the Reduction of Contracts From 12 to 11 or 10 to 9 Months Be Considered As An Alternative In The Event Of Cutbacks In Funding?"
(Frequencies)

Classification	Yes	No	No. of Respondents
Total Group	138	38	176
Secondary Prog.	115	30	145
Post-Secondary Prog.	12	3	15
Sec. and Post-Sec. Prog.	11	5	16
Superintendents	64	6	70
Presidents	7	0	7
Local Voc. Dir.	58	30	88
Deans	3	0	3
Other	6	2	8

No. of Respondents = 176 .

APPENDIX D

(Comments)

COMMENTS

We need a closer relationship between the local and state level personnel.

Allocate construction and equipment funds on enrollment data.

Eliminate duplication of reports, data requirements, etc.

This is a good way to get everyone's input.

Local administrators should have more input on makeup of local programs and long-range planning.

Use committees or a cabinet for major decisions -- not one man's opinion.

Eliminate the unnecessary vocational conferences and utilize the funds in a better method.

Develop a closer relationship between industry, junior colleges and secondary programs.

Develop formulas for equipment distribution and publish it.

Carefully study the need for a program in a given area before agreeing to fund it.

Avoid building two vocational centers side-by-side for a city and county -- tell them to get together.

State staff is excellent in most cases although there's weak personnel in a couple of areas.

Try a micro-computer system to store budget and purchasing data, student and curricular information, etc. This would save time.

Assist in standardizing programs across the state.

More involvement of all vocational directors rather than a chosen few.

Continual assistance with AIM.

Quit pouring tons of money into post-secondary programs and throwing a few dollars at the secondary programs.

Share information concerning construction and equipment so previous mistakes can be avoided.

Reduce the authority of local superintendents -- often these people are our greatest obstacle.

Assure that vocational programs are not dumping grounds.

Supervisors and assistant supervisors need to visit and offer help to all programs instead of raising hell when there are problems.

Many times there are no replies to our letters and phone calls.

State department positions should be filled with people who have had successful programs in the field.

Develop an audit system to identify those programs that are properly funded and administered -- pull funding from programs which do not meet standards.

Setup a separate and independent SDVTE.

Make funds available for P.R. activities.

Improve the pay for SDVTE personnel.

Transfer equipment from complex to complex and better utilization of surplus equipment.

Provide district workshops for T & I teachers -- involve both junior college and high school teachers.

Provide local administrators with a calendar of due dates for submission of reports.

Have regional meetings with superintendents to discuss policy decisions that affect the delivery of vocational education in Mississippi.

Have less paperwork asking for the same things over and over.

Develop procedures, etc. for certification of Vocational Guidance Counselors -- Most have no vocational background and are not much help as counselors.

Don't duplicate programs at the high school and junior college -- especially within the same district.

Cut all 12-month people to 10-month.

Eliminate agriculture.

Place less emphasis on special programs.

Require that vocational personnel be on duty during contract period.

The state staff is doing a great job with the limited funds available.

Develop a system to evaluate trade competency of non-degree instructors prior to certification.

Make state guidelines as reasonable as possible.

Do a curriculum revision and involve persons in business and industry in the process.